



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Testament? Who adheres to the former position of some students that the date of the authorship of the gospels and epistles is to be placed in the third and fourth, or even second century? Written ostensibly in the interest of science and religion, the article does not satisfy the rational thought of the former, but wounds the feelings of the latter, while its philosophic affiliation is with nothing more respectable than absurd naturalism.

GEORGE B. FOSTER.

ÜBER DEN QUELLENWERT DER SYNOPTISCHEN EVANGELIEN. Von LIC.

E. G. STEUDE; *Der Beweis des Glaubens*, 1897, Heft 3, 4, 5, pp. 89-101, 138-64, 189-206.

RECENT discussions concerning the credibility of the synoptic gospels have yielded three important results: (1) that the time of their composition cannot decide upon their value as historical sources; (2) that their narratives are not in a strict sense historical accounts; (3) that the words and sayings of Jesus are in this respect superior to the historical narratives.

It is very possible that factors such as Holtzmann emphasizes—for instance, among others, that the prophetic and inspired persons in the early Christian communities transferred to Jesus the Old Testament Messianic ideal, and ascribed to him, unwarrantably, deeds greater than the most eminent of the Old Testament worthies were supposed to have performed—may have been operative in the oral and written traditions to which our gospels go back. It is the work of the critic to ascertain if and in how far this has actually occurred. To this end the words and discourses of Jesus claim first attention, since the gospels are not primarily histories, but compositions intended to awaken and to strengthen faith. But our gospels, nevertheless, contain historical matter which invites credence. Hence the question arises, Shall we or shall we not accept all that they relate of the *deeds* of Jesus and of his *miracles*, and just as they relate them? Previous investigation does not enable us to reply confidently in the affirmative, though excluding the possibility of positive denial. To reach a more definite conclusion such a new starting point is needed as is afforded by those sayings of Jesus which present-day criticism pronounces best attested.

These are, in the first place, found in our present Matthew and Luke, who preserve, though in a somewhat different form, that collection of *λόγια* originally compiled by the apostle Matthew. In addition to these sections, common to Matthew and Luke, we have others common to these with Mark, who has not used the *λόγια*; who also preserves in his

gospel that tradition of which the basis was Peter's preaching. Finally there appears throughout the discourses of the synoptic gospels a nucleus of an entirely individual character, whose genuineness is indisputable. From these assured results of criticism it must *first* be determined with what the discourses of Jesus furnish us concerning his own conception of his person and work, viz., his *self-consciousness*; and, *second*, what these same sections set forth concerning his *deeds* and *miracles*.

1. An examination is made of fourteen sections, not as comprising all those sayings of Jesus which are genuine, but as representative utterances, covering the greater part of his ministry.¹ These are Matt. 9: 15-17; Mark 2: 27-28; Matt. 5: 21-48; Luke 11: 31, 32; Luke 10: 23, 24; Matt 10: 15; Mark 9: 37; Matt. 9: 2; Matt. 12: 22-32; Matt. 11: 7-11; Mark 12: 35-37; Luke 10: 21-24; Matt. 26: 26-29; Matt. 26: 64. Thus *seven* sections are common to all three gospels, *five* common to the first and third, *one* is peculiar to Matthew, and *one* to Mark. Where the accounts differ in particulars or arrangement, a consideration of the general trend of the gospel, of the connection into which the sayings are brought, and a comparison of their wording, restore to us somewhat exactly their original form.

This done, it appears that Jesus had a most exalted idea of his own person and work. Thus he places his preaching on a level higher than that of Jonah — his wisdom than that of Solomon. He represents himself to be a perfect interpreter of the law, even as a new law-giver, and claims for himself the right of Sabbath legislation against the strict letter of the law. He possesses authority (*ἐξουσία*) to forgive sins; claims that to himself as Messiah the promises of Psalm 110 refer; pronounces his disciples happy in being privileged to hear what the prophets desired to hear, but heard not, and threatens with fearful doom that city which will not receive the preaching of his messengers. These and other expressions of his Messianic consciousness (*cf.* the significance of the words in connection with the institution of the Last Supper, and his answer before the Sanhedrin, as to his continued existence), that he is in complete and exclusive possession of the truth and knowledge of God, are in that utterance of Jesus (Matt. 11: 25-30 and

¹ See the parallel passages in *A Harmony of the Gospels*, by Stevens and Burton. The references given above are those which the writer has seemed to regard as in form or connection most closely approximating to the original sources. "The arrangement of the 'oracles' from Matthew's original collection is more original in Luke, the wording more original in our Matthew."

Luke 10: 21-24) merged into one majestic expression, than which there is nothing loftier in the synoptic gospels, which is like an "aërolite from the Johannean heaven."

2. It remains to be seen what these best-attested sayings of Jesus set forth in particular concerning his miracles. *Four* instances are considered, which stand in such intimate relation to the speeches in which they are found that they must be regarded as integral parts of them (Matt. 9: 1-8; Matt. 12: 22-32, and parallels), or as inexplicable, unless they gave rise to the speeches (Matt. 11: 20-24; 11: 4, 5, and parallels). As a result it appears: (1) that Jesus performed cures not only upon minds diseased, but those sick in body, and not only on those whose bodily disease was psychically conditioned, nor in few instances, but in great numbers; (2) that Jesus had a clear and complete consciousness that he was able to do and that he did extraordinary deeds; (3) and that he conceived these deeds to be an essential part of his Messianic office, and to be miracles in an absolute sense. That theory, therefore, which explains miracles in accordance with known laws of nature, and makes Jesus, surprised at his first success, regard them, in self-deception, as deeds which he as the Messiah was divinely empowered to perform, is impossible. For, in the two instances most fully attested (Matt. 9: 1-8; 12: 22-32), (*a*) faith as a spirit-exciting and body-controlling influence was absent; (*b*) Jesus was always confident and certain in his action; (*c*) the results were immediate; (*d*) physical means were not necessary, in the cases mentioned not employed; (*e*) the variety and number of instances (*cf.* Matt. 11: 4, 5; Luke 7: 22) exclude the possibility of assigning them to that class of nervous or imaginary disorders, curable by psychical or magnetic treatment. Finally, if Jesus were in this self-deceived, it is impossible to say in what he was not. Since his self-consciousness as to his miracles is a fact, his entire Messianic consciousness must therewith stand or fall.

Since from the above-named starting point this sure result has been attained, the further task of the historian is along this path, in consideration of the other words and acts of Jesus recorded in the gospels and epistles, to arrive at an assured answer to the question, Is and in how far is the "Christ of Faith" also the "Jesus of History"?

While in some instances the method and application of the criticism are somewhat overrefined or strained, and do not command immediate acceptance, this article yields results of permanent value. It is a strong presentation of the facts which make it impossible to accept that which, in respect to the discourses of our Lord, criticism pronounces genuine, and to reject those miracles without which the speeches

hang in air and become inexplicable. By showing that Jesus considered his miracles as an essential part of his work, bound up in the unity of his consciousness, the writer has made it impossible to reject the miracles without seriously impairing, if not destroying, the value of Jesus' testimony to his own being and work.

HENRY TODD DEWOLFE

FOXBORO, MASS.

LA NOTION BIBLIQUE DE LA DESCENTE DU CHRIST AUX ENFERS. Par C. BRUSTON; *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie*, January 1897, pp. 57-78; March 1897, pp. 169-82. (Since reissued separately, with the addition of a discussion of 1 Tim. 3:16, under the title, "La Descente du Christ aux enfers." Paris: Fischbacher. 1897.)

THE amplified form of the Apostles' Creed says that Jesus descended into hell. In the teaching of Jesus there is not the slightest basis for this view. The word in John 20:17 plainly refers only to the time *since* the resurrection. The thought of Acts 2:27 is that the soul of Jesus did not come into the possession of sheol. Had the poet wished to say that God would not leave his soul *in* sheol, he would have said לִשְׁאוֹל, and not בְּשְׁאוֹל.

In spite of the clear word of Jesus, the belief early spread in the church that his soul descended into hades in the moment of death, and that in the interval before his resurrection he conquered the powers of hell, preached the gospel to the dead, and delivered the Old Testament saints out of the subterranean regions. Biblical basis for these views are Eph. 4:8 and 1 Pet. 3:19. These passages differ in two points from the view of the early church.

(1) According to ecclesiastical authors and the Apostles' Creed this descent was *before* the resurrection of Jesus; according to Paul and Peter it was *after* the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus.

(2) According to the majority of the fathers the descent of Jesus had as its object the deliverance of the righteous of the old covenant from hades; according to Paul its object was to conquer the powers of darkness, and according to Peter it was to announce the gospel to the spirits most guilty and most severely punished.

In Eph. 4:8-10 the word *πρωτον*, which is added to *κατέβη*, is the work of some copyist who sought to conform the text to the current belief. The passage speaks of what is done by the exalted Christ. The descent into hell is spiritual, like his descent to his church.